



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,923	01/02/2001	Joel D. Tucciarone	004-0003	7355

46064 7590 08/17/2005

LAU & ASSOCIATES
7701 ROCKLEDGE COURT
SPRINGFIELD, VA 22152

EXAMINER

RETTA, YEHDEGA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3622

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/750,923

Applicant(s)

TUCCIARONE ET AL.

Examiner

Yehdega Retta

Art Unit

3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-53 and 65-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-53 and 65-72 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/20/05.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3622

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This office action is in response to amendment filed April 28, 2005. Applicant amended claims 1, 4, 5, 39 and added new claims 65-72. Claims 1, 4-53, 65-72 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 65-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant's specification does teach the requesting and collecting of information being performed by a trusted or third party. If applicant could indicate a support for the claimed invention in applicant's disclosure then the rejection would be withdrawn.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 4 recites the limitation "in the record". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "in view of the record". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 3622

Claims 69 and 70 recites the limitation "wherein a feature of one of the trusted intermediary and the third party". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 65-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 65 recites wherein the request and collecting of information is performed by being one of a trusted intermediary and a third party. It is not clear what a trusted or third party is, since the request is performed by a user. Is the user, who is making a request for information, as claimed in claim 1, considered a third party? Applicant should amend the claim in order to distinctly claim the subject matter applicant considers as the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an

Art Unit: 3622

international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1, 4-53, 65-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Murphy et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,298,307.

Regarding claims 1, 4-53 and 65-72, Murphy teaches making a request indicating a type of information; entering duration; receiving the information; a record to capture the request and result; analyzing the behavior of the requester; determining actual duration; taking an action based on the result (fig. 5B (505, 506))...determining the amount of the result in the record (see col. 10 lines 41-54); Murphy teaches user preference database to record past activity of the user; action is one of made a purchase, not a purchase etc.,(see col. 1 line 62 to col. 2 line 61, col. 3 line 40 to col. 4 line 41, col. 7 line 63 to col. 9 line 11 and col. 10 line 55 to col. 11 line 18, Fig. 5A). Murphy teaches collecting a result obtained from the network (see fig. 5B (504)) and storing the request and the result (see fig. 5A & 5B, col. 10 line 55 col. 11 line 18). Murphy teaches the collecting done by other than the user requesting the information (third party).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3622

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chern et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,381,465.

Regarding claim 12, Murphy does not teach determining whether to issue electronic refund or coupon, it is taught in Chern (see fig. 15-17). Chern teaches alert message with advertising in order inform the consumer of promotion (see col. 13 lines 36-64). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to combine Murphy's event notifier with Chern's alert message with advertisement for the purpose of enticing consumer to take advantage of the promotional activity.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed April 28, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the prior art, Murphy does not teach storing in a memory the request and the result. Murphy teaches receiving a request and processing the request. In order for the request to be processing and the result be transmitted to the user the information have to be stored, therefore it is inherent feature.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 3622

Hassett et al. (US 6,807,558) teaches receiving a variety of information from a plurality of sources, organizing the variety of information into an information categories and distributing the information based on the information categories request by a client.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened-statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yehdega Retta whose telephone number is (571) 272-6723. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (571) 272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

YR

Yehdega Rehta
YEHDEGA
PATENT EXAMINER